A U M

Union does not mean a sameness of organization or method, but a friendly recognition.
—Rorert Crosbie

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLII June, 1954 No. 8

A TRIAL OF STRENGTH

IN everyone's life there comes a time—perhaps several times—when he feels that what is happening to him is "just too much," when he finds himself involved in the well-known "intolerable situation." The principal idea, at such times, seems to be to change the circumstances, to get out of the situation, and there may be no harm in this, except that the indignation and sense of wrong which are usually the psychic accompaniments of the effort toward freedom will probably bear examination.

What we may be reluctant to realize is that a part of evolution may require us to become involved in a succession of intolerable situations —until we are able to define genuine "intolerability" with care and discrimination. To cite the classic instance, Arjuna found the great war chronicled in the *Mahabharata* intolerable, and occupied much of the patient Krishna's time in lamenting the bitterness of his plight. There is nothing to be especially ashamed of, then, in longing for release. It happens to every being, even to Arjuna, "the best of the Kurus."

The only trouble with a "classic instance" is that, when it is brought to our attention, we are not in a classical mood. *Our* situation lacks the ultimate decision of a great battlefield. It is more a matter of an unpleasant and really very uncooperative individual with whom we are obliged to work; or a set of circumstances which we did not deliberately design which hems us in. Indeed, we find ourselves in the difficult position only because of our high and self-sacrificing motives—it is really *too much!*

Perhaps it is that those who elect to work in the vineyards of Truth still cherish an inner feeling that the work, because it is in behalf of Truth, should be made a little easier. Being on the right side, after all, should involve at least a few prerogatives, such as opportunity to find more amiable companions, and not having to cope with aspects of life to which we are not in the least attracted. The idea that there is, "*first,* our own work, in and on ourselves, each one," is sometimes regarded as a more or less private affair, having little to do with how we face, or refuse to face, the intolerable situations which confront us from time to time. Yet more important than taking flight from an intolerable situation is discovering, at least in principle, what made it come about.

All intolerable situations, we may say, come from ignorance. There are many kinds of ignorance, therefore many kinds of intolerable situations. There is ignorance of human nature, the human nature belonging to ourselves and to others, and this leads to the creation of relationships in which people act in ways we would not have predicted, causing us, perhaps them also, much unhappiness. We hoped for something quite different. Here, the intolerability results from actions which brought an unexpected result. Are we willing to study those actions, or do we just "want out"? A man may say, "But it is plainly my *duty* to get out of this situation!" He might better say, "Duty lies in not getting into such situations, so that if I escape from this one, even on grounds of high morality, without understanding what brought it about, I will be just as vulnerable in the future as I am now."

Ignorance of matter may produce another sort of intolerable situation. A man may argue that he wishes to build a bridge for the holy ones of the earth to walk upon. The motive is laudable, but he had better learn the art of bridge-building first. There is a kind of unwieldy sectarianism in the notion that a bridge of noble purposes need not have the solid foundations which support the traffic of worldly commerce. The man who says, "What need have I of mundane knowledge—I who serve a higher cause?"—will soon come to grief, carrying his high cause with him. He is like the man who, arguing in behalf of the wisdom of the ages, feels free to pick his facts from the air and his enthusiasm from righteous emotion. In both cases, the world will laugh, or be indifferent.

It may be true that a man who puts behind him the thought of personal gain will have the blessings of the Law for potential allies. How-

ever, the importance of forgetting oneself is not solely a matter of overcoming a nasty tendency called "selfishness." The practical value of foregoing attachment to the fruits of action lies in the clarity of judgment which results. But other attachments besides longing for riches may cloud the vision. The apparently noble thrust of a heart too confidently pure may hide elements of escapism, of unwillingness to accept the discipline of vulgar acquisition. We need to think of these things when we encounter "intolerable situations."

One trouble with science is that it is absolutely merciless to all forms of sentimentality. And occultism, we are told, is a species of science. Of all occult processes, the most painful, perhaps, is that which slowly ejects all the false piety from our bewildered souls. After we have wrestled with the personal-god idea on the intellectual level, the psychic attitudes it has engendered in the race for many centuries must also have their inconsistencies exposed. These latter are deviously ensconced in countless strongholds of the personal nature, closely woven in with feelings of pride, our "rights," our notions of "justice," and even what we may sometimes call our "self-respect." All these have to go, to be replaced by more truly "scientific" estimates of the values in human life.

One familiar mood of the personal-god idea is found reflected in the expression, "Did I make a mistake? Well, I'll pay for what it cost." There are those who seem to think that it is possible to pay for mistakes with money—to buy their way out of trouble. This is usually offered, incidentally, with a certain Jehovistic grandeur. In the world of effects, a man can buy off his mistakes with money—so long as he has the money—but in the world of causes, his money is no good at all. A mistake is a tendency which is not changed by hiring somebody to clean up the mess. Paying for the mistake is like praying for help, for all it accomplishes on the plane of causes. The time will come when the money is gone, when God turns his face away from the sinner, and this is then the intolerable situation, a hell indeed.

There are in fact situations which we ought not to tolerate, but these are seldom situations from which we are eager to take flight. They are rather situations or orientations of the mind—forms of emotional extravagance, or habits of thoughtlessness, which eventually work their way out on to the plane of daily life, there, as mere effects, to be mistaken for the source of human unhappiness. Caught in these situations of outward life, we feel ourselves compromised, frustrated, unjustly

dealt with by experience. Yet through them, Nature, or Karma, is only exhibiting to us an aspect of existence which we have not yet understood. We have dealt with forces, laws, and phenomena in a mood of blind faith, and not with the spirit of science.

You can almost see the personal nature frown and withdraw in a pique when any hint of the need for searching self-examination of this sort is presented by another. Anger shrouds the brow and a vindictive sort of retort in self-defense leaps to the tongue. This is plainly a bad habit, yet widely prevalent. The question of self-examination, when pressed, too often has close resemblance to an "intolerable situation." We have no business, of course, in pressing self-examination on others, but when it happens, by accident perhaps, there are profound lessons to be learned from the result. Our strength is tested.

The outcome of the test depends upon the habits of mind to which one has trained himself. The central problem of the sectarian is that he has never acquired the habit of looking impartially at himself or his beliefs. He fears the genuine freedom of honesty at this level for the reason that he suspects he will find too much that needs changing. And there lies *his* sense of intolerability. It may be the same with those whose cherished beliefs are expressed in the declaration that they are not sectarian at all! For a belief is not the same as knowledge, and profession is not the same as practice.

The tremendous value in honest self-examination is that it inspects feelings and moods as closely as it inspects ideas and doctrines. It obliges the identification of what the heart holds dear by means of the *functions* of the heart—what it cleaves to, what it rejects—and tests the beliefs maintained according to this practical standard. In time, for the one who learns to accept this discipline with eagerness, intolerable situations can no longer exist.

We must be ready to say at any moment under whatever circumstances, whether expected or unexpected: "It is just what I in fact desired." We must cultivate complete resignation to the Law, the expression and operation of which is seen in the circumstances of life and the ebb and flow of our inner being.

—WM. Q. JUDGE

"LET EVERY MAN PROVE HIS OWN WORK"

[H. P. Blavatsky left India in April, 1885, going to the continent of Europe where she spent two years, struggling against poverty, illness and adverse climatic conditions, while writing *The Secret Doctrine.* Her ill-health became so serious in the spring of 1887 that some devoted English theosophists arranged for her to pass the summer in a cottage at Norwood, and in the autumn she took residence at 17 Lansdowne Road, London. Then began the final cycle of her work, which saw the establishment of *Lucifer,* the formation of the Blavatsky Lodge, and publication of *The Secret Doctrine, The Key to Theosophy, The Voice of the Silence* and *The Theosophical Glossary.* The present article, "Let Every Man Prove his Own Work," which appeared in *Lucifer* for November 15, 1887 (last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for November, 1941) is characteristic of the editorials she contributed to its pages.—Eds., THEOSOPHY.]

SUCH is the title of a letter received by the Editors of *Lucifer.* It is of so serious a nature that it seems well to make it the subject of this month's editorial. Considering the truths uttered in its few lines, its importance and the bearing it has upon the much obscured subject of Theosophy, and its visible agent or vehicle—the Society of that name—the letter is certainly worthy of the most considerate answer.

"Fiat justitia, ruat coelum!"

Justice will be done to both sides in the dispute; namely, Theosophists and the members of the Theosophical Society[1] on the one hand, and the followers of the *Divine Word* (or Christos), and the so-called Christians, on the other.

We reproduce the letter:

"To the Editors of LUCIFER

"What a grand chance is now open in this country, to the exponents of a noble and advanced religion (if such this Theosophy be[2]) for

---

[1] Not all the members of the Theosophical Society are Theosophists; nor are the members of the so-called Christian Churches all Christians, by any means. True Theosophists, as true Christians, are very, *very* few; and there are practical Theosophists in the fold of Christianity, as there are practical Christians in the Theosophical Society, outside all ritualistic Christianity. "Not every one that saith unto me 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father." (Matthew, vii, 21.) "Believe not in ME, but in the truths I utter." (Buddha's *Aphorisms.*)

[2] "This" Theosophy is not a religion, but rather *the* RELIGION—if one. So far, we prefer to call it a philosophy; one, moreover, which contains every religion, as it is the essence and the foundation of all. Rule III. of the Theos. Body says: "The Society represents no particular religious creed, is entirely *unsectarian,* and includes professors of all faiths."

proving its strength, righteousness and verity to the Western world, by throwing a penetrating and illuminating ray of its declared light upon the terribly harrowing and perplexing practical problems of our age.

"Surely one of the purest and least self-incrusted duties of man, is to alleviate the sufferings of his fellow man?

"From what I read, and from what I daily come into immediate contact with, I can hardly think it would be possible to over-rate in contemplation, the intense privation and agonizing suffering that is—aye, say it—*at this moment* being endured by a vast proportion of our brothers and sisters, arising in a large measure from their not absolutely having the means for procuring the *bare necessaries of existence.*

"Surely a high and Heaven-born religion—a religion professing to receive its advanced knowledge and Light from 'those more learned in the Science of Life,' should be able to tell us something of how to deal with such life, in its primitive condition of helpless submission to the surrounding circumstances of—civilization!

"If one of our main duties is that of exercising disinterested love towards the Brotherhood, surely 'those more learned' ones, whether in the flesh, or out of it, can and will, if appealed to by the votaries, aid them in discovering ways and means for such an end, and in organising some great fraternal scheme for dealing *rightly* with questions which are so appalling in their complexity, and which must and do press with such irresistible force upon all those who are earnest in their endeavours to carry out the will of Christ in a Christian Land? "L. F. FF."

"October 25, 1887."

This honest-spoken and sincere letter contains two statements; an implied accusation against "Theosophy" (*i.e.,* the Society of that name), and a virtual admission that Christianity—or, again, rather its ritualistic and dogmatic religions—deserve the same and even a sterner rebuke. For if "Theosophy," represented by its professors, merits on external appearance the reproach that so far it has failed to transfer divine wisdom from the region of the metaphysical into that of practical work, "Christianity," that is, merely professing Christians, churchmen and laymen, lie under a like accusation, evidently. "Theosophy" has, certainly, failed to discover *infallible* ways and means of bringing all its votaries to exercise "disinterested love" in their Brotherhood; it has not yet been able to relieve suffering in mankind at large; but neither has Christianity. And not even the writer of the above letter, nor any one else, can show sufficient excuse for the Christians in this respect. Thus the admission that "those who are earnest in their endeavour to

carry out the will of Christ in a Christian land" *need the help of* " 'those more learned,' whether (pagan adepts) in flesh, or (spirits?) out of it" is very suggestive, for it contains the defence and the *raison d'être* of the Theosophical Society. Tacit though it is, once that it comes from the pen of a sincere Christian, one who longs to learn some practical means to relieve the sufferings of the starving multitudes—this admission becomes the greatest and most complete justification for the existence of the Theosophical Brotherhood; a full confession of the absolute necessity for such a body independent of, and untrammelled by, any enchaining dogmas, and it points out at the same time the signal failure of Christianity to accomplish the desired results.

Truly said Coleridge that "good works may exist *without* saving (?) principles, therefore cannot contain in themselves the principles of salvation; but saving principles never did, never can exist without good works." Theosophists admit the definition, and disagree with the Christians only as to the nature of these "saving principles." The Church (or churches) maintain that the only saving principle is belief in Jesus, or the carnalized Christ of the soul-killing dogma; theosophy, undogmatic and unsectarian, answers, it is not so. The only *saving* principle dwells in man himself, and has never dwelt outside of his immortal divine self, *i.e.,* it is the true Christos, as it is the true Buddha, the divine inward light which proceeds from the eternal unmanifesting unknown ALL. And this light *can only be made known by its works—faith* in it having to remain ever blind in all, save in the man himself who feels that light within his soul.

Therefore, the tacit admission of the author of the above letter covers another point of great importance. The writer seems to have felt that which many, among those who strive to help the suffering, have felt and expressed. The creeds of the churches fail to supply the *intellectual* light, and the true wisdom which are needed to make the practical philanthropy carried out, by the true and earnest followers of Christ, a *reality.* The "practical" people either go on "doing good" unintelligently, and thus often do harm instead; or, appalled by the awful problem before them, and failing to find in their "churches" any clue, or a hope of solution, they retire from the battlefield and let themselves be drifted blindly by the current in which they happen to be born.

Of late it has become the fashion for friends, as well as for foes, to reproach the Theosophical Society with doing no practical work, but

losing itself in the clouds of metaphysics. Metaphysicians, we are told, by those who like to repeat stale arguments, have been learning their lesson for the last few thousand years; and it is now high time that they should begin to do some practical work. Agreed; but considering that the Christian churches count nearly nineteen centuries of existence, and that the Theosophical Society and Brotherhood is a body hardly twelve years old; considering again that the Christian churches roll in fabulous wealth, and number their adherents by hundreds of millions, whereas the Theosophical Brotherhood is but a few thousand strong, and that it has no fund, or funds, at its disposal, but that 98 per cent of its members are as poor and as uninfluential as the aristocracy of the Christian church is rich and powerful; taking all this into consideration, there would be much to say if the theosophists would only choose to press the matter upon the public notice. Meanwhile, as the bitterest critics of the "leaders" of the Theosophical Society are by no means only outsiders, but as there are members of that society who always find a pretext to be dissatisfied, we ask: Can works of charity that will be known among men be accomplished without money? Certainly not. And yet, notwithstanding all this, none of its (European) members, except a few devoted officers in charge of societies, will do *practical* work; but some of them, those especially who have never lifted a finger to relieve suffering, and help their outside, poorer brothers, are those who talk the most loudly, and are the bitterest in their denunciations of the *unspirituality* and the unfitness of the "leaders of theosophy." By this they remove themselves into the outer ring of critics, like those spectators at the play who laugh at an actor passably representing Hamlet, while they themselves could not walk on the stage with a letter on a salver. While in India, comparatively poor theosophists have opened gratuitous dispensaries for the sick, hospitals, schools, and everything they could think of, asking no returns from the poor, as the missionaries do, no abandonment of one's forefathers' religion, as a heavy price for favours received, have the English theosophists, as a rule, done a single thing for those suffering multitudes, whose pitiful cry rings throughout the whole Heavens as a protest against the actual state of things in Christendom?

We take this opportunity of saying, in reply to others as much as to our correspondent, that, up till now, the energies of the Society have been chiefly occupied in organising, extending, and solidifying

the Society itself, which work has taxed its time, energies and resources to such an extent as to leave it far less powerful for practical charity than we would have wished. But, even so, compared with the influence and the funds at the disposal of the Society, its work in practical charity, if less widely known, will certainly bear favourable comparison with that of professing Christians, with their enormous resources in money, workers, and opportunities of all kinds. It must not be forgotten that practical charity is not one of the *declared* objects of the Society. It goes without saying, and needs no "declaration," that every member of the Society must be practically philanthropic if he be a theosophist at all; and our declared work is, in reality, more important and more efficacious than work in the everyday plane which bears more evident and immediate fruit, for the direct effect of an appreciation of theosophy is to make those charitable who were not so before. Theosophy creates the charity which afterwards, and of its own accord, makes itself manifest in works.

Theosophy is correctly—though in this particular case, it is rather ironically—termed "a High, Heaven-born Religion." It is argued that since it professes to receive its advanced knowledge and light from "those more learned in the Science of Life," the latter ought and *must,* if appealed to by their votaries (the theosophists), aid them in discovering ways and means, in organising some great fraternal scheme, etc.

The scheme was planned, and the rules and laws to guide such a practical brotherhood, have been given by those "more learned in the Science of (practical, daily, *altruistic*) life"; aye, verily "more learned" in it than any other men since the days of Gautama Buddha and the Gnostic Essenes. The "scheme" dates back to the year when the Theosophical Society was founded. Let anyone read its wise and noble laws embodied to this day in the Statutes of the Fraternity, and judge for himself whether, if carried out rigorously and applied to practical life, the "scheme" would not have proved the most beneficent to mankind in general, and especially to our poorer brethren of "the starving multitudes." Theosophy teaches the spirit of "non-separateness," the evanescence and illusion of human creeds and dogma, hence, inculcates *universal love and charity for all mankind "without distinction of race, colour, caste or creed";* is it not therefore the fittest to alleviate the sufferings of mankind? No true theosophist would refuse admission into a hospital, or any charitable establishment, to any man, woman or

child, under the pretext that he is *not* a theosophist, as a Roman Catholic would when dealing with a Protestant, and *vice versa.* No true theosophist of the original rules would fail to put into practice the parable of the "Good Samaritan," or proffer help only to entice the unwary who, he hopes, will become a pervert from his god and the gods of his forefathers. None would slander his brother, none let a needy man go unhelped, none offer fine talk instead of practical love and charity.

Is it then the fault of Theosophy, any more than it is the fault of the Christ-teachings, if the majority of the members of the Theosophical Society, often changing their philosophical and religious views upon entering our Body, have yet remained practically the same as they were when professing *lip* Christianity? Our laws and rules are the same as given to us from the beginning; it is the general members of the Society who have allowed them to become virtually *obsolete.* Those few who are ever ready to sacrifice their time and labour to work for the poor, and who do, unrecognised and unthanked for it, good work wherever they can, are often too poor themselves to put their larger schemes of charity into objective practical form, however willing they may be.

"The fault I find with the Theosophical Society," said one of the most eminent surgeons in London to one of the editors, quite recently, "is that I cannot discover that any of its members really lead the Christ-life." This seemed a very serious accusation from a man who is not only in the front rank of his profession, and valued for his kindly nature, by his patients, and by society, and well-known as a quiet doer of many good deeds. The only possible answer to be made was that the Christ-life is undeniably the ideal of every one worthy in any sense of the name of a Theosophist, and that if it is not lived it is because there are none strong enough to carry it out. Only a few days later the same complaint was put in a more graphic form by a celebrated lady-artist.

"You Theosophists don't do enough good for me," she said pithily. And in her case also there is the right to speak, given by the fact that she leads two lives—one, a butterfly existence in society, and the other a serious one, which makes little noise, but has much purpose. Those who regard life as a great vocation, like the two critics of the Theosophical movement whom we have just quoted, have a right to demand of such a movement more than mere words. They themselves endeavour very quietly to lead the "Christ-life," and they cannot understand a

number of people uniting in the effort towards this life without practical results being apparent. Another critic of the same character who has the best possible right to criticise, being a thoroughly practical philanthropist and charitable to the last degree, has said of the Theosophists that their much talking and writing seems to resolve itself into mere intellectual luxury, productive of no direct good to the world.

The point of difference between the Theosophists (when we use this term we mean, not members of the Society, but people who are really using the organization as a method of learning more of the true wisdom-religion which exists as a vital and eternal fact behind all such efforts) and the practical philanthropists, religious or secular, is a very serious one, and the answer, that probably none of them are strong enough yet to lead the "Christ-life," is only a portion of the truth. The situation can be put very plainly, in so many words. The religious philanthropist holds a position of his own, which cannot in any way concern or affect the Theosophist. He does not do good merely for the sake of doing good, but also as a means towards his own salvation. This is the outcome of the selfish and personal side of man's nature, which has so coloured and affected a grand religion that its devotees are little better than the idol-worshippers who ask their deity of clay to bring them luck in business, and the payment of debts. The religious philanthropist who hopes to gain salvation by good works has simply, to quote a well-worn yet ever fresh witticism, exchanged worldliness for other-worldliness.

The secular philanthropist is really at heart a socialist, and nothing else; he hopes to make men happy and good by bettering their physical position. No serious student of human nature can believe in this theory for a moment. There is no doubt that it is a very agreeable one, because if it is accepted there is immediate, straightforward work to undertake. "The poor ye have always with you." The causation which produced human nature itself produced poverty, misery, pain, degradation, at the same time that it produced wealth, and comfort, and joy and glory. Lifelong philanthropists, who have started on their work with a joyous youthful conviction that it is possible to "do good," have, though never relaxing the habit of charity, confessed to the present writer that, as a matter of fact, misery cannot be relieved. It is a vital element in human nature, and is as necessary to some lives as pleasure is to others.

It is a strange thing to observe how practical philanthropists will eventually, after long and bitter experience, arrive at a conclusion which, to an occultist, is from the first a working hypothesis. This is, that misery is not only endurable, but agreeable to many who endure it. A noble woman, whose life has been given to the rescue of the lowest class of wretched girls, those who seem to be driven to vice by want, said, only a few days since, that with many of these outcasts it is not possible to raise them to any apparently happier lot. And this she distinctly stated (and she can speak with authority, having spent her life literally among them, and studied them thoroughly), is not so much from any love of vice, but from love of that very state which the wealthy classes call misery. They prefer the savage life of a bare-foot, half-clad creature, with no roof at night and no food by day, to any comforts which can be offered them. By comforts, we do not mean the workhouse or the reformatory, but the comforts of a quiet home; and we can give chapter and verse, so to speak, to show that this is the case, not merely with the children of outcasts, who might be supposed to have a savage heredity, but with the children of gentle, cultivated, and Christian people.

Our great towns hide in their slums thousands of beings whose history would form an inexplicable enigma, a perfectly baffling moral picture, could they be written out clearly, so as to be intelligible. But they are only known to the devoted workers among the outcast classes, to whom they become a sad and terrible puzzle, not to be solved, and therefore, better not discussed. Those who have no clue to the science of life are compelled to dismiss such difficulties in this manner, otherwise they would fall, crushed beneath the thought of them. The social question as it is called, the great deep waters of misery, the deadly apathy of those who have power and possessions—these things are hardly to be faced by a generous soul who has not reached to the great idea of evolution, and who has not guessed at the marvelous mystery of human development.

The Theosophist is placed in a different position from any of these persons, because he has heard of the vast scope of life with which all mystic and occult writers and teachers deal, and he has been brought very near to the great mystery. Indeed, none, though they may have enrolled themselves as Fellows of the Society, can be called in any serious sense Theosophists, until they have begun to consciously taste

in their own persons, this same mystery; which is, indeed, a law inexorable, by which man lifts himself by degrees from the state of a beast to the glory of a God. The rapidity with which this is done is different with every living soul; and the wretches who hug the primitive taskmaster, *misery,* choose to go slowly through a tread-mill course which may give them innumerable lives of physical sensation—whether pleasant or painful, well-beloved because tangible to the very lowest senses. The Theosophist who desires to enter upon occultism takes some of Nature's privileges into his own hands by that very wish, and soon discovers that experiences come to him with double-quick rapidity. His business is then to recognise that he is under a—to him—new and swifter law of development, and to snatch at the lessons that come to him.

But, in recognising this, he also makes another discovery. He sees that it takes a very wise man to do good works without danger of doing incalculable harm. A highly developed adept in life may grasp the nettle, and by his great intuitive powers, know whom to relieve from pain and whom to leave in the mire that is their best teacher. The poor and wretched themselves will tell anyone who is able to win their confidence what disastrous mistakes are made by those who come from a different class and endeavour to help them. Kindness and gentle treatment will sometimes bring out the worst qualities of a man or woman who has led a fairly presentable life when kept down by pain and despair. May the Master of Mercy forgive us for saying such words of any human creatures, all of whom are a part of ourselves, according to the law of human brotherhood which no disowning of it can destroy. But the words are true. None of us know the darkness which lurks in the depths of our own natures until some strange and unfamiliar experience rouses the whole being into action. So with these others who seem more miserable than ourselves.

As soon as he begins to understand what a friend and teacher pain can be, the Theosophist stands appalled before the mysterious problem of human life, and though he may long to do good works, equally dreads to do them wrongly until he has himself acquired greater power and knowledge. The ignorant doing of good works may be vitally injurious, as all but those who are blind in their love of benevolence are compelled to acknowledge. In this sense the answer made as to lack of Christ-like lives among Theosophists, that there are probably

none strong enough to live such, is perfectly correct and covers the whole question. For it is not the spirit of self-sacrifice, or of devotion, or of desire to help that is lacking, but the strength to acquire knowledge and power and intuition, so that the deeds done shall really be worthy of the "Buddha-Christ" spirit. Therefore it is that Theosophists cannot pose as a body of philanthropists, though secretly they may adventure on the path of good works. They profess to be a body of learners merely, pledged to help each other and all the rest of humanity, so far as in them lies, to a better understanding of the mystery of life, and to a better knowledge of the peace which lies beyond it.

But as it is an inexorable law, that the ground must be tilled if the harvest is to be reaped, so Theosophists are obliged to work in the world unceasingly, and very often in doing this to make serious mistakes, as do all workers who are not embodied Redeemers. Their efforts may not come under the title of good works, and they may be condemned as a school of idle talkers, yet they are an outcome and fruition of this particular moment of time, when the ideas which they hold are greeted by the crowd with interest; and therefore their work is good, as the lotus-flower is good when it opens in the mid-day sun.

None know more keenly and definitely than they that good works are necessary; only these cannot be rightly accomplished without knowledge. Schemes for Universal Brotherhood, and the redemption of mankind, might be given out plentifully by the great adepts of life, and would be mere dead-letter utterances while individuals remain ignorant, and unable to grasp the great meaning of their teachers. To Theosophists we say, let us carry out the rules given us for our society before we ask for any further schemes or laws. To the public and our critics we say, try to understand the value of good works before you demand them of others, or enter upon them rashly yourselves. Yet it is an absolute fact that without good works the spirit of brotherhood would die in the world; and this can never be. Therefore is the double activity of learning and doing most necessary; we have to do good, and we have to do it *rightly,* with knowledge.

* * * * *

It is well known that the first rule of the society is to carry out the object of forming the nucleus of a universal brotherhood. The practical working of this rule was explained by those who laid it down, to the following effect:—

"HE WHO DOES NOT PRACTISE ALTRUISM; HE WHO IS NOT PREPARED TO SHARE HIS LAST MORSEL WITH A WEAKER OR POORER THAN HIMSELF; HE WHO NEGLECTS TO HELP HIS BROTHER MAN, OF WHATEVER RACE, NATION, OR CREED, WHENEVER AND WHEREVER HE MEETS SUFFERING, AND WHO TURNS A DEAF EAR TO THE CRY OF HUMAN MISERY; HE WHO HEARS AN INNOCENT PERSON SLANDERED, WHETHER A BROTHER THEOSOPHIST OR NOT, AND DOES NOT UNDERTAKE HIS DEFENCE AS HE WOULD UNDERTAKE HIS OWN—IS NO THEOSOPHIST."

[The title of the foregoing article by H.P.B. serves as particularly fitting reminder of a basic principle upon which the United Lodge of Theosophists was founded, forty-five years ago February last. In the history of humankind, few have been the associations whose members were determined to let each pursue "good works" in his own way. Apparently, H.P.B. felt that one of the most beneficial results of the spread of Theosophy would be a lessening of the notion that a few may rightfully define the nature of good works—or bad ones—for the many. All her great articles in *Lucifer* plead for a broader wiew than that of religious provincialism—she was indeed "Lucifer" to the ostentatiously respectable England of the nineteenth century. When men spend most of their energy deciding how others should live and think, they must perforce give little attention to what they themselves are actually doing and why. So it was the intent of H.P.B. to wean her listeners of the habit of moralizing—that they might, eventually, become truly ethical in their own thoughts and actions.

Moralisms and provincialisms have doubtless developed within U.L.T. but never with the encouragement of its declaration of principles and purposes. That document, simple though it is and was meant to be, focusses attention upon the fact that one who pursues the theosophic life can measure the success of this pursuit only by the degree to which he constantly enlarges his perspectives. The Theosophist can "prove" only one thing in argument with his Christian or materialist brothers—that he thinks their sincere beliefs worthy of sympathetic attention. The measure of the superiority of Theosophy can be taken in no other way.—Eds., THEOSOPHY.]

WORD PUZZLES

IT is easily conceivable that more could be written concerning the words *ethics* and *morality* than about any other two terms in the English language. This, for the reason that, from a theosophical point of view, every man has a concern with establishing some measure of consistency, purpose, and general helpfulness to others—and also finds he is being measured by the yardsticks of other peoples' customs. Thus he is at once involved in both *ethics* and *morality.* The latter, of course, thrusts itself upon him at every turn, while his ethical interests are galvanized only by his own will.

Morality, actually, comprises the bedrock of politics, as well as of religion. Ideal political systems are, for instance, attempts to establish canons of *morality* according to principles of organization; the same holds true with utopian economies. Every philosophical *system* is somewhat similarly concerned, and, if we turn to the arts, here again is noted the inescapable human propensity for contrasting the ideal with the non-ideal, even if only in terms of the search for beauty or perfection of form; this, too, has to do with *ethics* and *morality.*

Though often used synonymously, however, *ethics* and *morality* carry with them distinguishing implications. Yet we need not regret this somewhat confusing common usage of both terms since nothing could be more destructive of enlightenment than an easy conviction that all matters containing the "good" are easily classifiable. In this eventuality we would have nothing but "mores," even if pretentiously misnamed *ethics.* This type of approach to solving the ethical dilemma consistently runs hand in hand with authoritarianism—and condemnation of all deviations from established norms of thinking or behavior.

The Theosophist is bound to feel a certain preference for the word *ethics* over *morality,* since *ethics,* according to *Webster,* includes concern with "motive or character." *Morality* is a more limited designation, emphasis being placed upon "manner, custom, habit." The man who strives to be an ethical philosopher, in other words, is preoccupied with the principles of philosophy, whereas the moralist is the man whose approach to the mysteries of human conduct is categorical rather than inquisitive or sympathetic.

Cicero is said to have coined the word *moral* as a derivation of the Greek *ethicos;* subsequently, Latin usage of *moral* implied matters of custom and conventionality rather than of ethical principle. As Joseph Shipley has it in his *Dictionary of Word Origins,* "an immoral act was originally just one to which folks were unaccustomed—was related to *morose,* which at first meant fastidious, as a stickler for the customary, the proper thing; then (by excess of this) unsocial, gloomy, sour."

With this background one can understand why the psychiatrist, Brock Chisholm, while acting as Director General of the World Health Organization, once attributed nearly all of the difficulties of humanity to "the idea of *morality* itself." Dr. Chisholm did not mean to imply that he had no interest in *ethics*—in fact, his denunciation of *morality* was apparently inspired by an ethical concern. He simply saw that men turned moralists became authoritarians in the home, despots in religion, and dictators in politics. Hence the belief that one knows what is good for everyone else obviously leads him away from sympathetic understanding, toward condemnation, and ultimately, to favor punishment for deviation.

An enlightening article upon the distinctions to be made between the philosophy of *ethics* and the philosophy of *morality* appears in James Hastings' monumental *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.* Under the heading of "Moral Law," we find the following:

> The concept of law is one of the two concepts which may be taken as fundamental in an ethical system. According as we start from the idea of a good to be attained or of a law to be obeyed, we have a teleological or a jural theory of ethics. The former of these was the characteristic type of Greek theories; the latter became predominant in Christian times. Under the teleological conception morality is looked upon as fundamentally a matter of self-expression or self-realization, and its laws are regarded as rules for the attainment of a good which every man naturally seeks. It is in this sense that Socrates was able to maintain his paradoxical position that no man is willingly vicious and that all vice is ignorance. Such a position is essentially a naturalistic one, implying a native goodness in human nature which needs only enlightenment to realize its natural good. Moral conduct is the rational pursuit of happiness.
>
> In a jural system of ethics, on the other hand, human nature is conceived as divided against itself and therefore in natural opposition to the good. Morality is not a harmonious development of natural powers guided by the idea of happiness, but a life of discipline and subordination to an authoritative law. It is not the natural value or

the pleasure of an act that renders it moral, but its value as commanded by the law. It is not commanded because it is good, but it is good because commanded.

It is evident, therefore, from this distinction of starting-points and attitudes that the term 'moral law,' in its strict meaning, denotes an imperative, regarded as having practical efficacy in conduct. The idea is of an order which is to be imposed upon human nature and, accordingly, to be accepted by the rational will. One must, therefore, distinguish between such an imperative, which does not rest upon any natural desire for happiness, and a moral rule or law in the teleological sense of the term. The moral laws, in the teleological view, are not imperative, but counsels of prudence, pointing out the best ways for the attainment of happiness. Their practical efficacy rests upon a natural desire for satisfaction, and hence, in their hypothetical character, they have more the nature of uniformities in the scientific sense of the term 'law.' They are rules of applied psychology. Although such rules are often spoken of as laws, yet, lacking the element of imperativeness, they are perhaps better not designated by that term.

Hastings also notes that the concept of *ethics* inevitably carries with it the idea of necessary self-discipline. The ethical man is one who is attempting to learn the essentials of an improved philosophy. He thus becomes a "disciple," and his discipline "is, properly, instruction." He may find his instruction in doctrine, but only if he converts the words of the doctrine or doctrines considered into understanding of the principles they are meant to represent. The *ethical* man, then, must be an independent thinker—one does not become *ethical* by dutiful religious observances nor by practice of piety, *unless* the spontaneous element of self-discovery is present in evolving reasons to sustain these traditional counsels of perfection.

Lookout for January, 1953, reported some sentiments voiced by Sir Gladwyn Jebb which are illustrative of this point. According to Sir Gladwyn:

We should "make our own laws" in the sense of embracing some principles which justify, at any rate to ourselves, an otherwise purposeless and meaningless existence. That is hard enough, but "keeping our own laws" is harder. Here one sometimes feels like the Latin poet who said, "I recognize better things and approve them: I pursue worse things." Yet even to *recognize* the good is something: indeed it is a great deal. It means constantly acquiring knowledge, whether in great books or in the great school of life. It means having sympathy and understanding. It means striving. And it means having a readiness, at least, for some kind of personal self-sacrifice.

> All of us have occasionally met people who seem to have made and kept their own laws. They are the creative ones. Their personalities are in some way illuminated from within. Perhaps, as the Greeks thought, they have often learned through suffering. But they alone are happy because they are fulfilling their manhood.

Mohandas Gandhi spoke similarly in a lecture to students, insisting upon the necessity for spontaneity in all genuine ethical conduct—thus repeating the sentiment expressed by Krishna in *The Bhagavad-Gita* to the effect that "restraint" is a poor substitute for those improved *perceptions* which make improved *conduct* automatic. Then Gandhi added a dimension important to Theosophists, calling attention to the fact that we have the traditions of the great sages of all time to think about; their inspiration, at least in part, *can* become an inspiration of our own towards wider ethical awareness. Yet the time and manner of adopting the ethical principles of a sage, Gandhi implied, must be determined by each one for himself.

The moralist is, by definition and often by temperament, a factionalist. He has a political view of both religion and education, believing that other men must be fitted to his mold. Thus he tends to become the wrong sort of politician and the wrong sort of educator. He will, at least in extremity, employ force to gain conformity, and thus he also exhibits the psychological attitude of a dictator. Easy it is, once one begins to travel this road, to be much more concerned with potential enemies than with potential friends. Similarly, since the educator is obliged to draw out from the child his own innate ethical perceptions, the moralist works in opposition to all true teachers—not being concerned with anyone's formulation of right or wrong save his own.

"Moralisms" can easily find sanctuary in nationalist complexes, being associated with the feeling of national or cultural superiority. Some recent remarks by Alvin C. Eurich, an official serving the Ford Foundation's Advancement of Education fund, are here pertinent:

> When we reach the point where we feel that we are superior to all other peoples, when we decide what is best for them regardless of their inheritance, when we try by every means available to us to impose our culture on another—then we can be sure that we are going down hill. These tendencies toward strong centralization of power and abdication of individual responsibility, toward forcing conformity on our citizens, toward imposing our way of life on another,—a debtor nation—these tendencies are all violations of the principles that made our country great.

> Clearly the dangers to our future arise internally from our failure to recognize the need to provide equal opportunities to all men regardless of race, color, national origin, or economic status; our failure to adhere to the basic ideas and principles of freedom on which this nation was founded and from our lack of acceptance of our individual responsibilities. Externally, our chief dangers arise from sheer ignorance of our failure to learn about other peoples and cultures and our unwillingness to apply to peoples everywhere those very principles that have made our own country great.

Mr. Eurich is here making an *ethical* criticism of a contemporary American *morality.* He asks his fellow citizens to assess, philosophically, their own preconceptions and prejudices. Similarly, though in somewhat different context, H. P. Blavatsky criticized conventional moralities of her day. In neither case, though, we may note, do denunciations of personal character play a part, this unnecessary aspect of controversy being reserved for the moralists themselves.

H.P.B. does write of the need for an improved *morality,* but makes it clear that such improvement is only to be obtained by devotion to the principles of a philosophy which embodies the spirit of universal brotherhood. We cannot, of course, do without all *morality,* any more than we are presently able to do without some form of religion or, in our daily living, without habits. But we can and should recognize that all our moralities are in need of improvement.

And morality is a private matter, as intimated by Sir Gladwyn. When we philosophize, or weigh our own motives in terms of ethical principles, we are speaking a universal language; in our determination of ways and means for implementing ethical principles, the language is private, both the "morals" and responsibility for them being entirely our own. Finally, then, the relationship between *ethics* and *morality* seems to be essentially the same as that existing between religion and philosophy, or between belief and knowledge. Transition from the point of view of "morals" to the point of view of *ethics* may be obtained, through the same slow evolutionary process which may someday make devisive creeds and factional illusions of superiority ultimately vanish from the face of the earth. Further, incarnation of the Manasic principle—referred to more than once in H. P. Blavatsky's *Five Messages to the American Theosophists*—will, in all three instances, supply the necessary dynamic.

THE MYSTERY OF INDIVIDUALITY

II. The Monad as a Unit

THE problems centering around man's individuality are numerous. To state a few: Does individuality or self-consciousness have a beginning? If it should begin in time, will it not inevitably some day cease? If individual units are absorbed into the One Life during a period of Pralaya, what logic supports the assurance that they will re-emerge as the same entities? Are there self-conscious individualized entities actively present at the commencement of a new universe? Inasmuch as the term "monad" means, by derivation, a unit, are all monads permanent, individualized units, and will the monad of an atom consequently some day become the monad of a man? The last question will receive treatment in this article. The remaining questions will be discussed in future articles of this series.

The term "monad" means a unit; the Monad is life regarded as a unit—though, according to H. P. Blavatsky, the term is one "which may apply equally to the vastest Solar System or the tiniest atom."[1] Elsewhere she indicated: "the Monads (*Jivas*) are the Souls of the Atoms,"[2] and in the following statement she makes reference to their individuality:

> The Monads of the present dissertation are treated, from the standpoint of their individuality, as *atomic Souls,* before these atoms descend into pure terrestrial form. For this descent into *concrete* matter marks the medial point of their own individual pilgrimage. Here, losing in the mineral kingdom their individuality, they begin to ascend through the seven states of terrestrial evolution . . ."[3]

In the following quotation from the *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge,* we have graphically depicted the source of monadic life in the lower kingdoms, and again the stress appears to be on differentiation of nature into individual centers:

> The different variations of plants, etc., are the broken rays of one Ray. As the ray passes through the seven planes, it is broken on every plane into thousands and millions of rays down to the world of forms, every ray breaking into an intelligence on its own plane. So that we see every plant has an intelligence, or its own purpose of life, so to speak, and its own free will to a degree. . . . *every plant without an exception* feels and has a consciousness of its own. But besides the

---

[1] *Secret Doctrine* I, 21 [2] *S.D.* I, 619 [3] *S.D.* I, 619

latter, every plant—from the gigantic tree down to the minutest fern or blade of grass—has, Occultism teaches us, an Elemental entity, of which it is the outward *clothing* on this plane. (p. 97.)

. . . Occultism . . . maintains that every atom of matter, when once differentiated, becomes endowed with *its own* kind of Consciousness. Every *cell* in the human body (as in every animal) is endowed with its own peculiar discrimination, instinct, and, speaking relatively, with intelligence. (p. 25.)

In one of her articles, Mme. Blavatsky quoted with apparent approval the hypothesis that "every being and naturally-formed object is in its beginning, a spiritual or monadial entity . . . each, according to species, evolves from its monadial centre an essential aura, which has positive and negative magnetoïd relations with the essential aura of every other . . ."[4]

On the other side of the picture, however, we have her insistence that "the *Monads* are not *discrete* principles, limited or conditioned, but rays from that one universal *absolute* Principle. The entrance into a dark room through the same aperture of one ray of sunlight following another will not constitute *two* rays, but one ray intensified."[5] She makes clear that the use of the plural form of the word "monad" in connection with the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms is due to the exigencies of explanation and that the student must not allow the idea of unity to escape him. The following reference from *The Secret Doctrine* shatters all concepts that the monads in the lower kingdoms are fully individualized entities:

Now the Monadic, or rather Cosmic, Essence (if such a term be permitted) in the mineral, vegetable, and animal, though the same throughout the series of cycles from the lowest elemental up to the Deva Kingdom, yet differs in the scale of progression. It would be very misleading to imagine a Monad as a separate Entity trailing its slow way in a distinct path through the lower Kingdoms, and after an incalculable series of transformations flowering into a human being; in short, that the Monad of a Humboldt dates back to the Monad of an atom of horneblende. Instead of saying a "Mineral Monad," the more correct phraseology in physical Science, which differentiates every atom, would of course have been to call it "the Monad manifesting in that form of Prakriti called the Mineral Kingdom." The atom, as represented in the ordinary scientific hypothesis, is not a particle of something, animated by a psychic something, destined after æons to blossom as a man. But it is a concrete mani-

[4] THEOSOPHY 6: 517 [5] *S.D.* II, 167

festation of the Universal Energy which itself has not yet become individualized; a sequential manifestation of the one Universal Monas. The ocean (of matter) does not divide into its potential and constituent drops until the sweep of the life-impulse reaches the evolutionary stage of man-birth. The tendency towards segregation into individual Monads is gradual, and in the higher animals comes almost to the point.[6]

Why is it misleading to imagine a Monad as a separate entity trailing its slow way in a distinct path through the lower kingdoms? Why at one moment does it appear that the monads are to be viewed as units, and in the next their individuality is denied? Anticipating these objections, the author of *The Secret Doctrine* wrote:

In calling the animal "Soulless," it is not depriving the beast, from the humblest to the highest species, of a "soul," but only of a conscious surviving *Ego-soul, i.e.,* that principle which survives after a man, and reincarnates in a like man. The animal has an astral body, that survives the physical form for a short period; but its (animal) Monad does not re-incarnate in the same, but in a higher species . . .[7] [Wm. Q. Judge: ". . . it is not meant that no dog or other animal ever re-incarnates as dog, but that the monad has tendency to rise to a higher species, whatever that be, whenever it has passed beyond the necessity for further experience as 'dog.' "[8]]

An interesting explanation of this is to be found in the same volume: ". . . the two higher principles [Atma-Buddhi or the Monad] *can have no individuality on Earth,* cannot be *man,* unless there is (*a*) the Mind, the *Manas-Ego,* to cognize itself, and (*b*) the terrestrial *false* personality, or the body of egotistical desires and personal Will, to cement the whole, as if round a pivot (which it is, truly), to the physical form of man. . . . Incarnate the Spiritual Monad of a Newton grafted on that of the greatest saint on earth—in a physical body the most perfect you can think of . . . and, if it lacks its middle and fifth principles, you will have created an *idiot*—at best a beautiful, soul-less, empty and unconscious appearance. '*Cogito—ergo sum*'—can find no room in the brain of such a creature, not on this plane, at any rate."[9] Atma and Buddhi are not, then, incarnated even in man, except through Manas, to say nothing of the lower kingdoms. To the Monad, our matter does not exist. Manas exists to it and is the only "existence." The Monad, Atma-Buddhi, represents the spiritual line of evolution. It joined with the physical only upon the descent of the reincarnating Ego.

---

[6] S.D. I, 178 [7] *S.D.* II, 196fn [8] THEOSOPHY 2: 444 [9] *S.D.* II, 241-2

In view of all the preceding, it would appear that the term "individuality" is employed in at least two ways in the Theosophical philosophy. In the lower kingdoms the term may be applied to the monadic centers, or "sparks of eternity"; these centers, however, are temporary units, immortal in essence, but as units can be totally absorbed when entering the radius of activity of more advanced entities. They *are* units, they *are* immortal, but they know it not. They have memory, but even though loaded with impressions cannot arouse their own memories, and once those memories are aroused, cannot cease remembering. They have direct perceptions, instinctual and highly intelligent, but do not know that they do, and though they act, cannot voluntarily initiate action. They have no form of their own, but use any available one.

When one contemplates the countless numbers of atoms, on all planes, going to make up a world such as ours, is it conceivable that the life in each is destined to become *a* man? As these are, in one aspect of their dynamism, emanations of higher, impersonal intelligences, perhaps it is only the few that become evolving and ever-expanding individual vortices, capable of attracting and absorbing lesser lives, and entering on the path of individual growth. Analogy would suggest this to be so when we think of the trillions of seeds that never germinate, never become individual trees and plants. They are not lost, to be sure, but have their invaluable place as fertilizers and nutriment for the "few." In fact, it would appear that through such service the lower becomes absorbed by and a permanent part of the higher, sharing thereby in growth and experience. It is inevitable that all lives be raised to higher and higher states of consciousness and intelligence, and how this is accomplished is of little importance. Once the nectar from separate flowers is blended into honey in the hive, who cares from which flower each component element was derived? It is now all one. From this viewpoint it becomes understandable why the "population" of the mineral kingdom is less than that of the vegetable world.

In each incarnation, man expands through the process of "accretion," transforming lower life permanently to the plane of the self-conscious thinker. *The Secret Doctrine* states that the physical body "serves as the vehicle for the 'growth' (to use a misleading word) and the transformations through Manas and—owing to the accumulation of experiences—of the finite into the INFINITE, of the transient into the Eternal and Absolute."

NUMBER, THE RULING DEITY

PYTHAGORAS, being asked what was the wisest of things, said it was Number. Number, he said, "is the ruler of forms and ideas, the most ancient and ruling Deity. Number is the canon, the reason, the intellect and the most undeviating balance of the composition and generation of all things." The first essence, according to Pythagoras, is of the nature of Number. The heavens and the stars derive their beauty and order by the participation of the first and intelligible essence. The Pythagoreans asserted that the doctrine of Numbers—the chief of all in esotericism—had been revealed to men by the celestial deities. Between men and numbers also, they said, was a science of correspondence.

"Deity geometrizes," says Plato, referring to no personal God. Deity is Number, and *Number* is Deity. This is asserted as a first principle in all ancient philosophies and cosmogonies. Plato teaches that "the Soul is a Number." Hence the converse is true—*Number* is the Soul. According to Orpheus, "the eternal essence of number is the most providential principle of the universe; it is the root of the permanency of divine things, of Gods and daemons." But in what sense can numbers be called Entities? Only when intelligent Entities are meant. When numbers are regarded simply as digits they are, of course, not Entities but symbolical signs. Porphyry thus explains that the Pythagorean numerals were "hieroglyphical symbols by means whereof he taught ideas concerning the nature of things," or the origin of the universe.

If there is no anthropomorphic and personal God, how is it that the process of universal formation is geometrical, *i.e.,* by Dots, Lines, Triangles, Cubes, Circles and finally Spheres? asks H. P. Blavatsky. "The term 'God,' unless referring to the Unknown Deity, which can hardly be supposed *acting* in any way, has always meant in ancient philosophies the collectivity of the working and intelligent forces in Nature. The word 'Forest' is singular, yet it is the term to express thousands or even millions of trees of different kinds. The truth, however, of Nature ever 'geometrizing' is easily ascertained. It is seen . . .

NOTE.—Based upon statements from standard theosophical works.

in the physical and mechanical law that particles or bodies in motion of themselves assume a spheroidal form—from a globular planet down to a drop of rain; in the snowflakes which along with crystals exhibit all the geometrical forms existing in nature. When motion ceases, the spheroidal shape alters, becomes a flat drop, then forms an equilateral triangle, a hexagon and so forth. Ice particles on breaking up are found to assume first the triangular or pyramidal shape, then the cubical and finally hexagonal, etc. In depicting the crystalline forms of snowflakes, physical science shows their modifications of a hexagonal prism which shoots out an infinity of delicate needles. It has studied them so perfectly that it has even calculated, with the most wonderful mathematical precision, that all of these needles diverge from each other at an angle of 60 degrees. Can physical science tell us as well the *cause* of this endless variety of these exquisite forms, each of which is a perfect geometrical figure in itself?"

There is no chance evolution, nor is any so-called abnormal appearance or cosmic phenomenon due to haphazard circumstances. "The smallest as the most immense creations," said Balzac, "are to be distinguished from each other by their qualities, their quantities, their dimensions, their forces and attributes, all begotten by Number. God is a Number endowed with motion. . . . The existence of the Number depends on Unity, which, without a single number, begets them all."

The use of geometrical figures and frequent allusions to figures in all ancient Scriptures—the Puranas, Egyptian papyri, "Book of the Dead," and even the Bible—must be explained. In *Sepher Jezirah,* or Numbers of Creation, the whole process of evolution is given out in Numbers. In the "Book of Dzyan" as in the Kabala, there are two kinds of numerals to be studied—the figures, often simple blinds, and the Sacred Numbers, the values of which are all known to the Occultists through initiation. The former is but a conventional glyph, the latter is the basic symbol of all. That is to say, the one is purely physical, the other purely metaphysical, the two standing to each other as matter stands to spirit—the extreme poles of the one Substance.

No Theosophist, not even as an accepted Chela, could expect to have the secret teachings explained to him thoroughly and completely before he had irrevocably pledged himself to the Brotherhood and passed through at least one initiation, because no figures and numbers could be given to the public, for figures and *numbers are the key to the eso-*

teric system. The Science of the Numerals is so sacred, indeed, and so important in the study of Occultism that the subject can hardly be skimmed, even in such a large work as *The Secret Doctrine.* It is on the Hierarchies and correct numbers of these Beings, invisible (to us) except upon very rare occasions, that the mystery of the whole Universe is built.

From the very beginning of Æons—in time and space on our Round and globe—the mysteries of nature were recorded by the pupils of those same now invisible "heavenly men," in geometrical figures and symbols. The keys thereto passed from one generation of "wise men" to the next. Some of the symbols, thus passed from the east to the west, were brought therefrom by Pythagoras, who was not the inventor of his famous Triangle. The ten points inscribed within that "Pythagorean Triangle" are worth all the theogonies and angelologies ever emanated from the theological brain. For he who interprets them—on their very face, and in the order given—will find in these 17 points (the 7 mathematical points hidden) the uninterrupted series of the genealogies from the first heavenly to terrestrial man. And, as they give the order of beings, so they reveal the order in which were evolved the Kosmos, our earth, and the primordial elements by which the latter were generated. He who will master the mystery of our Earth will have mastered the mysteries of all others.

There are such things as metamathematics and metageometry. Even mathematics pure and simple proceed from the Universal to the particular, from the mathematical, hence indivisible point, to solid figures. The earliest forms of elementary geometry must have been suggested by the observation of the heavenly bodies and their groupings. Hence the most archaic symbols in Eastern Esotericism are a circle, a point, a triangle, a plane, a cube, a pentacle, and a hexagon, and plane figures with various sides and angles. This shows the knowledge and use of geometrical symbology to be as old as the world. Does the physicist comprehend the secret ciphered characters traced by the divine finger on every sea shell; on every leaf that trembles in the breeze; in the bright star whose stellar lines are in his sight but so many more or less lines of hydrogen?

"The laws of nature are the thoughts of God," exclaims Oersted, 2,000 years after Plato. "His thoughts are immutable," repeats the *solitary* student of Hermetic lore, "therefore it is in the perfect harmony

and equilibrium of all things that we must seek the truth." Plato, proceeding as did others, from the indivisible Unity, found emanating from it two contrary forces, each acting on the other and producing equilibrium, and the three were One, the Pythagorean Eternal Monad. "The primordial Point is a circle; the circle squaring itself from the four cardinal points becomes a quaternary, the perfect square, Tetragram." The philosophical cross, the two lines running in opposite directions, which the geometrizing Deity divides at the intersecting point, and which forms the magical as well as the scientific quaternary, is the basis of the occultist. Within its mystical precincts lies the master key which *opens the door of every science,* physical as well as spiritual. It symbolizes our human existence, for the circle of life circumscribes the four points of the cross, which represent in succession birth, life, death and immortality. Everything in this world is a trinity completed by a quaternary. And every element is divisible on this same principle.

Plato, having fully embraced the ideas of Pythagoras—who had brought them from India—compiled and published them in a form more intelligible than the mysterious numerals of the Greek Sage. The transcendental application of geometry to cosmic and divine theogony became dwarfed after Pythagoras by Aristotle. By omitting the point and the circle, and taking no account of the apex of the Triangle, Aristotle reduced the metaphysical value of the *Idea,* and thus limited the doctrine of magnitude to a simple Triad—the *line,* the *surface* and the *body.* His modern heirs, who play at Idealism, have interpreted these three geometrical figures as Space, Force and Matter.

The Hebrews followed in the footsteps of the Oriental philosophy —Chaldean, Persian, Hindu, Arabic, etc. The Arabs had their figures from Hindustan, and never claimed the discovery for themselves. One finds numbers and figures used as an expression and a record of thought in every archaic symbolical Scripture. They are ever the same, with only certain variations growing out of the first figures. Thus the evolution and correlation of the Mysteries of the Kosmos, of its growth and development—spiritual and physical, abstract and concrete—were first recorded in geometrical changes of shape. Every Cosmogony began with a circle, a point, a triangle, and a cube, up to the number nine, when it was synthesized by the first line and a circle, the Pythagorean mystic Decade (10), the sum of all, involving and expressing the mys-

teries of the entire Kosmos—recorded a hundred times more fully in the Hindu system, for him who can comprehend its mystic language. "The whole astronomical and geometrical portion of the secret sacerdotal language was built upon the number 10."

The sacredness of the cycle 4320, with additional ciphers, lies in the fact that the figures which compose it, when taken separately, or joined in various combinations, are each and all symbolical of the greatest mysteries in nature. Indeed, whether one takes the 4 separately, or the 3 by itself, or the two together, making 7, or again the three added together and yielding 9—all these numbers have their application in the most sacred and occult things, and record the working of Nature in her eternally periodical phenomena. They are never erring, perpetually recurring numbers, unveiling, to him who studies the secrets of Nature, a truly divine system, an *intelligent* plan in Cosmogony, which results in natural cosmic divisions of time, seasons, invisible influences, astronomical phenomena, with their action and reaction on terrestrial and even moral nature; on birth, death, and growth, on health and disease. The figures 1, 3, 5, 7 are perfect because thoroughly mystic, numbers playing a prominent part in every Cosmogony and evolution of living Beings. The explanation of this becomes evident when one examines the ancient Symbols.

"There is a Harmony of Numbers in all nature; in the force of gravity, in the planetary movements, in the laws of heat, light, electricity, and chemical affinity, in the forms of animals and plants, *in the perception of the mind.* The direction, indeed, of modern natural and physical science, is toward a generalization which shall express the fundamental laws of all by one simple numerical ratio." Are science and metaphysics then irreconcilable? The facts prove daily that this is one more fallacy among the many that have been uttered. The reign of Aristotle in the only exact and infallible science in the world of sciences, which proceeds from NUMBER—has ended. That of Plato, who *began* with Universals, as opposed to that of Aristotle who *rose* from particulars, is now opening. Today the question is being asked: "Do numbers and geometrical figures represent to human consciousness the laws of action in the divine mind," *i.e.,* that of Number, the ruling Deity? The Teachers reply, "They do, most assuredly."

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

WHAT is "soul," and what are its functions?

In terms of the Theosophic sevenfold classification of man, it is not too difficult to define the higher human soul—*Buddhi-Manas*—and, at least generally, to understand its relationship to the rest of man's nature. In this doctrinal approach, the student is aided by a vocabulary of terms which enable him to make necessary intellectual distinctions; these, in turn, clarify many questions concerned with the complex nature of man. Doctrine and vocabulary, then, are tools (just as symbology is) for furthering a comprehension of intangibles.

Through doctrine we know that man's nature is constituted of a series of vehicles to reflect and facilitate the divine potency, a basic part of every man. These all perform "functions"—limited tasks—for the soul. The soul *functions;* it does not, strictly speaking, "have" functions. However, in both the universe and in man, the Highest finds a vehicle in *Alaya* (the world-soul) or soul, the soul in mind or *manas, manas* in *kama,* and on down the scale to the astral and physical bodies. The whole Theosophical philosophy is based on the premise that the highest reality is Spirit, and that Evolution is the process by which spiritual units of intelligence, working through psychic and material forms, gradually come to deeper realizations of evolutionary purpose.

Doctrine, though, is chiefly a means of focussing attention upon certain ideas which are, for us, experimental. We must also have first-hand knowledge, the outcome of experience and perception. Thus each Theosophical student is required to become a philosopher in his own right. "Experience" by itself, of course, is meaningless. Doctrine, alone, is also meaningless. The soul or ego, the pilgrim experiencer, can only assimilate the fruits of knowledge by use of the higher reason, or *Buddhi-Manasic* faculty.

Every man has, *a priori,* certain premises which he either consciously or otherwise thinks and acts from, because they fit or seem plausible to his nature. Thus we refer to "natural theosophists" or "theosophists unaware," for their premises, values, and ethical standards are representative of Theosophy. A complete materialist, on the other hand,

is one who has at some time convinced himself that matter and sensual existence represent reality: he will therefore consistently reflect this criterion in his everyday life. Materialist or Idealist, we see that the core of any belief is based on the individual's first principles, and that any theory—economic, sociological, psychological, or philosophical, no matter how technical and complex—likewise stems from pre-assumptions about the nature of man.

As students, in disseminating even the simplest principles of Theosophic philosophy to the layman, we are often confronted with difficulties of language communication. These difficulties are not due to an overwhelming complexity of the central theosophic fundamentals, for the general concepts of karma, reincarnation, evolution, and deity are understood by "the masses" in the Orient. Easterners, let us say, are apt to have some idea of what the soul is and does.

There is growing, though, a popular vocabulary in the West which communicates some of the ABC's of the soul, even if often philosophically vague. Undoubtedly it ignores technical distinctions which are crucial to the logic of cosmology and anthropology, but this deficiency is not important in reaching the layman. The soul, for example, can be described in many ways. It represents character, self-respect, integrity, the basis of real manhood and womanhood. It is the quality in man which, in spite of material disadvantage, supports some principle or cause. The most important rights and liberties that we in the West enjoy are derived from the metaphysical concept of "the dignity of man," another reference to man's soul nature. The "Divine Light" or conscience of the Quakers is a crucial aspect of *Buddhi-Manas* or the soul. And it is undeniable that the "voice of conscience" is a common idea which exerts more than a little influence in the personal lives of most people. Such expressions as "self-realization" and "a man's got to be true to what's in him" refer to the idea of the development of individual potentialities. The Theosophical concepts of will and aspiration also have their partial counterparts in popular expressions like "guts," "conviction," and living a better or more "Christ-like" life.

The voice of soul in popular parlance, then, suggests that man live a more conscientious, principled, and manly life. Psychiatric terms provide a vocabulary which is more specific. Christian vocabulary in general affords numerous terms which can convey the spirit and meaning of Theosophical teachings. Depending on the individual mind

that is being met, it seems that there is a variety of opportunities by which the Theosophical message may be communicated, at least in part. Some of our troubles of communication, perhaps, stem from a tendency to talk about the soul only in familiar Theosophical terminology. Undoubtedly we need experience in translating "soul philosophy" into less abstract, popular language, for this, as well as the preservation of doctrine, is evidently of value to others.

How can one who is conscious of his failures prevent them from overwhelming him and thus interfering with future endeavors?

(*a*) To recognize one's failures is certainly necessary. One who does not realize that he has faults and failings can never progress or go about correcting them. But a funny thing can happen when we see our faults. Sometimes, the more we try to improve, the worse things seem to get. Perhaps we are just more conscious of them than ever before, but herein may lie the danger to future efforts. If we become too conscious of shortcomings, we are apt to be discouraged at the enormous task we have set before ourselves. If we give up because the task seems too heavy, however, we are preventing the good efforts we have made from fully becoming a part of ourselves. We are probably looking too much into the results of our actions.

Who can tell what real progress is? It is like a bucket collecting drops of sap from the maple tree. Watched, the progress is minute; but left to itself we may come back to find the bucket full. It is said that it is sometimes hard to tell what states of development we might have achieved in past incarnations. Our failures are a part of the very lessons the soul needs, and are sometimes, perhaps, self-appointed experiences undertaken consciously by the soul upon entering the body. We can do no more than our best, ever mindful of the fact that, as souls, we are none of our imperfections any more than we are our passions and desires, but that we are immortal beings—and that there is no end to time. With this view ever before us, our failures may become steppingstones to achievement.

(*b*) Let us ask what happens to these seeming failures when the personality dies. What remains? It is the effort that remains—for this has been gathered into the imperishable part of our nature—the effort and the propensity for striving toward our ideals. So, if in the long run it is "the effort that counts," then there is failure only when we have given up trying. It might help to remember what W. Q. Judge

wrote to someone who was worried about his progress: "We make a good deal of progress in our inner life of which we are not at all conscious. We do not know of it until some later life. All of our progress is in the inner nature and not in the physical where lives the brain, and from which the present question comes." (*Letters That Have Helped Me,* p. 114.)

The Voice of the Silence says that wasted smoke does not remain traceless, and that no efforts can vanish from the world of causes. From the mundane point of view, energy spent can never be recalled. Even from the scientific point of view, the disappearing smoke is still atomic energy. Having admitted the indestructibility of matter, what about its cause? If matter is immortal, how much more so its master, the mind?

A student who is convinced of the rebirth of all things therefore assumes that he will be confronted with the rebirth, so to say, of past *skandhas,* or tendencies. Recognizing this, and knowing that it may take lives to establish harmony throughout one's nature, one also knows that success cannot come without many failures along the way, and that the only real failure is not striving. For the self-satisfied, or those unconscious of personal failings, Lincoln stated: "My great concern is not whether you have failed, but whether you are content with your failure."

(*c*) The man who lets his failures assume such proportions that they overwhelm him has no conception of what he inherently is. Regardless of what circumstances arise, the Man is always greater than the circumstance. The man overwhelmed by his failures, who allows them to color all his future efforts and tinge them with the sickly color of failure, is like a giant caught in a briar patch—every move he makes gets him more and more entangled, until, goaded by each new pain, he loses all sense of what he is about and struggles frantically without direction or plan.

If he will stop for a while and realize that he is entangled because he *allowed* himself to be, he can easily lift himself out into a clear path. He must see the situation for what it is and proceed slowly—and with as little noise as possible—to what he is trying to accomplish.

Man can and must be the master of the situation at all times. To be less is to belittle That which he is. Even if he finds himself falling again and yet again, he must, though he falls in the attempt, get up again and again. The man within is a Hero and must act heroically.

THE FUNCTION OF CHALLENGE

MANY natural powers lie hidden in the depths of man's spiritual and psychological being. Of these, the power of *Will,* perhaps, is least of all understood by students of Exoteric Philosophy. The reason for this lack of knowledge concerning *Will* is twofold: first, because of the recondite nature of the power itself; second, because any power or faculty, to be understood, must be *used*—and which of man's spiritual or mental powers receives less use nowadays than the Will? The Teachers of Theosophy, in setting forth the Message for this age, refrained, doubtless deliberately, from giving detailed descriptions of the Will, simply saying that "there could be nothing gained by attempting to inquire into it apart from the Spirit and the desire."

Does this mean that the Will cannot be understood? Does it mean that the philosophy of Theosophy sets up prohibitions or restrictions beyond which the inquirer may not and dare not go? On the contrary, as everyone acquainted with its method knows, Theosophy is of the very essence of inquiry. It recognizes no mystery as being unsolvable if approached in the correct manner. It holds only that certain of man's powers are of such nature, spiritually and metaphysically, that they cannot be comprehended by intellect alone, nor by attempting to divorce them from the *usages* of Spirit and desire in the affairs of daily life. Through *usage,* through the putting of any power to test, the truth of its nature may be known.

How does one know, for example, the good and bad characteristics of his own mind except by efforts made to control and use it? How can a person prove or disprove the theory, currently popular in the field of psychosomatic medicine, that courage and good cheer possess power to restore even the physical body to health, unless a cheerful, courageous attitude of mind is assumed? How is any knowledge gained, whether moral, psychological or physical, except by putting into practice the theories and principles one holds to be true?

There is the tendency in men during Kali Yuga, or the Dark Age, to value head-learning above Soul-wisdom, to believe that all one needs to do to gain full comprehension of a subject is to read about it in a book, or to have someone supposedly learned in the subject tell him

all about it in detailed, analytical fashion. But spiritual teachers have always contended that *to know, one must become.* To understand, one must see with his own eyes—not by light reflected from the mind of another, however great that other may be. Theoretical knowledge has its place, it is true—especially such theory as sets forth the laws and principles underlying the science one proposes to master—but real Wisdom, direct Cognition, or spiritual Knowledge, as it is sometimes called, comes only with the application of those laws and principles.

The *Will,* it is said, is the greatest power in the human assemblage of complicated instruments. Without it, nothing of lasting spiritual value can be achieved. Will-power is the means by which the man of spiritual aspiration may rise, may lift himself above the weaknesses of his lower psychic nature. In fact, the degree of spiritual advancement one may have achieved is measurable in terms of *Will-action,* which is the extent to which the individual controls from within his thoughts, feelings and actions, or suffers them to be guided and controlled from without. Chelaship, it is said, is an attitude assumed, and maintained.

Will-power can never be understood, evidently, except by *using* it—each man for himself. It is in the affairs of daily life, in the solving of moral problems, that the expansion of man's faculties finds its full natural use and development. Is it not strange that though everyone wishes to possess strong character, few are willing to undertake the discipline necessary to achieve it, or to see, in the large and small problems of daily routine, the very opportunities needed for growth? Some individuals, it is clear, regard the obstacles of life as useless psychological rubbish which clutters the path of progress. Others would select for themselves, if possible, *problem-free* environments wherein, as they suppose, the blessings of life may be enjoyed without care or interruption. But verily—if we but knew it—life without obstacles, action without something to be overcome, would be unbearable. Without problems to challenge men's souls, the texture of their brains would grow soft, the discriminating faculty become dulled, and the whole of their being transform itself into a spineless, flabby mass. Just as physical man, without exercise or work, grows soft and unhealthy, so the inner man becomes weak and unproductive without obstacles to be overcome.

How many individuals in this day and age are strong enough from the inner spiritual side of their natures to be able to keep themselves

up to pitch without problems? How many are strong enough and spontaneous enough to create from within their own challenges, projects and occupations? For the most part, men are dependent for their inner and outer health upon the challenges of life which come to them in the form of duty, work and responsibility.

The great tragedy of wealth, as is evident to any real student of human nature, is that many individuals without sufficient force of moral spontaneity are relieved prematurely of responsibility. Deprived by fate of the hardships and trials that serve as discipline to the average man, these unfortunates are destined to drift, in all too many cases, without aim or purpose. It requires a strong character to occupy one's self constructively without the pressure of need and circumstance.

The statement of Jesus, "Ye must become as little children," possesses a wider application, perhaps, than one is likely to suppose. The child heart is not simply the pure heart, but the courageous one as well. Children "love" challenges. In fact, they are never happy without them. If the circumstances of life by which a child is surrounded afford no obstacles to challenge him, the child makes challenges for himself. Children require no special environment for happiness, for the exercise and display of their growing powers and capacities. Placed in the most humble surroundings, the child, unless spoiled by his parents, will find untold hurdles to challenge the strength of his spirit. What parent has not had the experience of being scared half to death by an announcement of their child from the top of a tree, by the ease with which he mimics the squirrel, or the exclamation of joy that he can balance himself on the eaves of the house? Unlike adults, children love their homes and surroundings, be they good or bad, and make full use of all obstacles for the gaining of needed strength. Only, with them, being nearer the spiritual estate of soul, they do not think in terms of obstacles or problems. Children think only in terms of *challenges.*

It is only the personality of man that desires physical ease and comfort—the Soul, never! The mission of the Soul is work, and if there seems to be nothing productive at hand, he must create work for himself. The *Paradise Lost* of childhood, or of Soul-hood, the search for which is depicted in the epics of every ancient myth and legend, can only be regained by *Will-action.* Like the child of ten, men should transform their problems into challenges. Every man should have a project—self-induced and self-devised.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Psychotherapists, too, Are Human

Lookout for September, 1953 (p. 524), called attention to Franz Alexander's critical revaluation of psychoanalytic techniques. The psychiatrist of today recognizes, says Dr. Alexander, that no longer can the analyst consider himself merely a "blank screen upon which the patient casts his emotional reactions": the analyst is, in addition, a "real personality" whose emotional reaction toward the patient is determined by his own personality structure.

This new concept of psychiatry, which Harry Stack Sullivan defined as "an expanding science concerned with the kinds of events and processes in which the psychiatrist participates while being an observant psychiatrist," is the approach now used by many psychotherapists; and is the basis for an article by Therese Benedek, M.D., in the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* for November, 1953.

Writing on "Dynamics of the Countertransference," Dr. Benedek states that although psychiatrists now recognize that "the relation between patient and therapist is a two-way street, . . . the fact that the emotions of the therapist can enter actively into the process of keeping the 'transference struggle' optimal, has received little study or discussion."

"Perception" not Necessarily Physical

The psychotherapist, Dr. Benedek says, must realize that even though he withdraws his *person* from the patient's sight, he yet remains a personality to his patient. That the physical senses provide only *one* avenue of perception, was brought sharply to Dr. Benedek's attention by the following experience:

> I was aroused from the convenient assumption that the patient is not supposed to sense the therapist as a person on a hot summer day, when I was still a very young analyst. The room was darkened against the sun. I was sitting behind the patient, a soft-spoken young woman. During a pause in which there was no noise, no movement, a pause which was not longer than that which I would usually wait for her associations, she began, "Dr. Benedek, should I tell you the dream again? because you did not hear it." She said this calmly, in her soft

> voice, without aggression. It was the truth. I asked her to tell the dream again, because I had not been listening. But I learned then that a patient *may listen to my silence, too.*

Thus, the very conditions of the psychoanalytic procedure tend to suggest to the psychiatrist (although certainly not in these *terms*), that "the real senses of man are not in the physical but in the astral body; and the intercommunication between minds is much more common than supposed."

Different Levels of Motivation

Dr. Benedek suggests that even though the psychotherapist is endeavoring to discover the deeply-buried motivations of the patient (often found to be "areas of immaturity"), a careful analyst must be ever on the alert to recognize "a normal ego-reaction of the 'adult' personality of the patient." If he fails to do so, and hence in an offhand manner ascribes a lower motivation to the "transference" than might have *properly* been recognized, great damage may be done to the therapist-patient relationship and the psychoanalytic process retarded materially. For this reason, Dr. Benedek says, in the interpreting of dreams, "it is the analyst's task to select from the many motivations which determine the manifest dream content, the one which gave the significant impulse to the dream." She continues:

> No doubt, the therapist's attitudes toward his patients generally, or toward the one patient specifically, may motivate his selection of the material and his handling of it. Some may even now call this countertransference. The point which I want to make is that the complication in therapy arises usually when the therapist has a blind spot against being recognized and reacted to by the patient as a *real person.* I have seen often that an analysis came to an impasse because the therapist either did not realize that the patient was talking about *him,* or if he realized it, he tended to avoid the issue, or he misunderstood the intention of the patient, because it put the therapist on the defensive.

"To Be the Better Able to Help Others"

Dr. Benedek calls attention to a changed emphasis resulting from application of the interpersonal *"field theory,"* as it was called by Sullivan. The new emphasis on "the ego and its defenses" applies not only to the patient (an admittedly disturbed individual) but also to the analyst, who should be—indeed must be—able to recognize and

deal with his own psychic idiosyncrasies even under the pressure of difficult and emotionally charged situations. Furthermore:

> While many analysts still perfunctorily repeat at the beginning of the therapy that no important decision should be made during the therapy, it became part of the therapeutic activity to analyze, and influence many of the actual decisions and life situations of the patient.
>
> Such a function, however, requires—even more than psychoanalysis did heretofore—emotional maturity, psychosexual stability, and personal integrity on the part of the therapist. These concepts, maturity and integrity, have to be more distinctly evaluated in relation to the tasks of the therapist than they are generally for describing ethical and personal attributes. In the analytic situation, they have to be combined with an intellectual honesty which is the result of the therapist's free access to his own unconscious motivations; for he has to be able to understand and check his countertransference reactions through all the vicissitudes of the analytic process.
>
> In conclusion: Psychoanalytic procedure is the unfolding of an interpersonal relationship in which transference and countertransference are utilized to achieve the therapeutic aim. This definition indicates that the therapist's personality is the most important agent of the therapeutic process.

Theosophical "Psychiatry"

The extent to which the "new" concepts of psychiatry are approaching long-established Theosophical principles for adequate human interrelationships, may be shown by the following passages from *The Friendly Philosopher:*

> At no time should any oppositional attitude be felt or assumed. If opposition exists even in thought, a counter opposition is set up, and the aim to enlighten is not effected.
>
> To carefully note things and not allow the notation to affect our proper course of conduct—that is, to note impersonally—is studying the hearts of men who make up the world in which we live; is studying man as a whole, in fact, for the whole is made up of the parts. Such an attitude neither judges nor condemns, but *notes,* in order to help understandingly.
>
> Each has to learn, to know, and to control his own nature, if he is to acquire discrimination—the ability to help others.

Adequacy in Human Relations

Psychiatric research has shown, and to a large extent explained, how "ideals" (for example, that of Universal Brotherhood) give way be-

fore the onslaught of personal prejudices and provincialism. What the psychiatrist calls "adequacy in human relationships," and what the Theosophist calls "Brotherhood in actu," demand a high degree of competence in one's relationships with others. And such competence depends *primarily* on one's ability to understand and control his own "intrapsychic," or *kama-manasic,* nature.

LEGEND, MYTH—OR FACT?

Scattered references throughout *The Secret Doctrine* to Stonehenge and the Druids indicate that the Druids are an important historical link with very ancient cultures, and popular tradition has correctly connected the two. In an article on "The Druids and Stonehenge," printed in the Dec. 31 issue of the *Listener*—a BBC publication—Stuart Piggott attempts to discover where fact ends, and legend and myth begin:

> Stonehenge is neither a myth nor a legend, nor are Druids. The legend of the Druids and Stonehenge is a learned one. It is not one of those whose origins are lost in a vague past of folk-tale. The general form the story takes would, I suppose, be something like this. The Ancient Britons had a priesthood called the Druids: they were philosophers, poets, and seers whose doctrines are known in detail and contain hints of higher things.
>
> There is no doubt about the Druids having had a real existence, and about their being a pre-Roman, Celtic priesthood. What we know about them is derived from the incidental, and always tantalisingly brief, mentions of them by Greek and Roman writers from about 200 *b.c.* to *a.d.* 350 or 400, and a very few inscriptions. The classical writers were not very interested in the Druids, the priests or the barbarian Celts, unless they came up against them in the way of business, as Caesar did in his Gaulish campaigns. On the whole, and quite reasonably, they wrote about them not as anthropologists or students of comparative religion, but rather as a colonial administrator sixty or seventy years ago might have recorded a few of the more startling facts about the witch-doctors and medicine men he had heard of or encountered in Africa or the orient.

DRUID CEREMONIES REPRESENT ANCIENT TRADITION

> From this evidence, and by inference from what we know of other early religions, we can sketch an outline picture of the Druids around the time of Caesar or later. The Celtic peoples of Gaul and Britain seem to have shared a similar social structure, and some religious concepts, with other speakers of the Indo-European languages: society was divided into three main groups, the priesthood, the warrior-

aristocracy, and the rest. You could be an aristocrat and a Druid, and during Caesar's campaigns in Gaul it was only natural that the Druids should form the centre of the resistance movement. Although they had no writing, the Celtic peoples possessed a considerable literature transmitted by word-of-mouth, and Caesar tells us that much of the novitiate's training for the priesthood was devoted to learning 'innumerable verses' by heart. This is the same as the strict Brahmin tradition of the present day.

Features of Druidism

The article continues:

> Of Druid doctrines, we know little except that they believed in some form of immortality, and in transmigration of souls; the Celtic belief in an after-life was so strong, indeed, that they would lend money on an I.O.U. to be repaid in the other world! But, by and large, there is nothing about the Druids or their religion which distinguishes them from other contemporary barbarian communities on the fringes of the classical world. But it should be said that no classical writer talks about Druid temples, except those which were mere clearings in the forest.

Data from Archaic Records

Mr. Piggott's discussion of the Druid religion suggests the value of reviewing the treatment of this subject in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 756 *et seq*):

> The mystery veiling the origin and the religion of the Druids, is as great as that of their supposed fanes is to the modern Symbologist, but not to the initiated Occultists. Their priests were the descendants of the last Atlanteans, and what is known of them is sufficient to allow the inference that they were eastern priests akin to the Chaldeans and Indians, though little more.
>
> Like the Hindus, the Druids believed in the doctrine of a succession of worlds, as also in that of seven "creations" (of new continents) and transformations of the face of the earth, and in a seven-fold night and day for each earth or globe. The Druids believed in the rebirth of man in a series of re-incarnations in this same world; for as Diodorus says, they declared that the souls of men, after determinate periods, would pass into other bodies.

Toward Harmonious Interrelations

The New York *Times* (Feb. 21) reports a "minor crisis" when Zuni Indians learned that one of their most sacred dances, the Shalako, had

been imitated and performed in public. According to the article, this ritual is staged each winter in the Zuni pueblo near Gallup, New Mexico, and the ceremony is considered so sacred that only lately has the public been admitted; cameras are still banned. The *Times* writer reports:

> The Zunis discovered recently that the ceremony had been studied closely so that outsiders were able to undertake imitations of it. They saw pictures of Boy Scouts in La Junta putting on a pseudo-Shalako dance. In considerable indignation, tribal leaders appealed to the United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Glenn Emmons, to put a stop to the imitations as a sacrilege offensive to the tribe.

Although the Scouts gave a special performance to a mission from the tribe, in order to demonstrate their sincerity, the emissaries considered the imitation a "mockery," and the Scout leaders finally agreed to discontinue the performances in deference to the Indians' feelings.

RESPECT FOR A BROTHER'S VISION

While such "deference" may mollify the feelings of the Zunis to some extent, it will not, we think, be a sufficient basis for mutual understanding. The Indian merits respect for his tribal institutions, respect for his traditional religious ceremonies, respect for his passionate desire for freedom—in short, "respect for a brother's vision." (See THEOSOPHY 40: 517.)

H. P. Blavatsky has much to say about the Zunis, indicating that "The Secret Doctrine" is often discernible in their tribal ceremonies. She writes:

> Their present-day customs, their traditions and records, all point to the fact that, from time immemorial, their institutions—political, social and religious—were (and still are) shaped according to the septenary principle. . . . Their sacerdotal hierarchy is composed of six "Priests of the House" seemingly synthesized in the seventh, who is a woman, the "PRIESTESS MOTHER."
>
> The Zuni priests receive an annual tribute, to this day, of corn of seven colours. Undistinguished from other Indians during the whole year, on a certain day, they come out (the six priests and one priestess) arrayed in their priestly robes, each of a colour sacred to the particular God whom the priest serves and personifies; each of them representing one of the seven regions, and each receiving corn of the colour corresponding to that region. . . . The "speckled" corn—each grain contain-

ing all the colors—is that of the "Priestess Mother"; woman containing in herself the seeds of all races past, present and future. Apart from these was the Sun—the Great Deity—whose priest was the spiritual head of the nation (*S.D.* II, 628-9).

FRIENDS ARE NEEDED

Disregard and disrespect for Indian tribes is not altogether a crime of the past, but today, at least, the "Red Man" has some understanding defenders. Among these, John Collier, formerly Commissioner of Indian Affairs, is particularly noteworthy—from a Theosophical point of view. For many years he has attempted to block misguided or thoughtless legislative attempts to disrupt tribal life. Recently, as revealed by a letter to the New York *Times* (Feb. 15), Mr. Collier attempted to awaken public opposition to "Indian Bills" now pending. He writes:

> In the name of "equalizing" the American Indians the Department of the Interior is sponsoring ten bills which, in the main, empower the Secretary of the Interior, without any statutory provision for the consent of the Indians' tribal governments, to terminate federal services and protections to, and liquidate the assets of, approximately 70,000 American Indians, about one-sixth of the total American Indian population. . . .
>
> The naked intent of the "termination" bills is to throw the burdens of federal obligations to the American Indians upon the states. Two states have already declared their opposition to the assumption of any such obligations. A number of Indian tribes have already registered their bitter opposition with the Department of the Interior. . . .
>
> What is actually meant is that the hard-won special rights of and services to the Indians for which many of them paid and are still paying a high price in lands, lives and economic hardships should be taken from them. . . . The assault against Indian rights is here the more menacing in that it is represented by numerous bills, varying, in the main, only in detail, rather than one piece of legislation, thereby potentially splintering effective opposition.
>
> The public can insist on a firm policy that any bills affecting the American Indians must contain a provision requiring the Indians' freely given consent as expressed through their tribal governing bodies or referenda of the tribal memberships. In so insisting we will be according the Indians their equal rights to local self-government consistent with the principle of government by the consent of the governed.

The "Theosophical point of view" is, in this case, easily identified by reference to H. P. Blavatsky's *Key to Theosophy* (p. 231). She there

opposes "the slightest invasion of another's right—be that other a man or a nation; any failure to show him the same justice, kindness, consideration or mercy which we desire for ourselves." She also remarks that "the whole present system of politics is built on the oblivion of such rights, and the most fierce assertion of national selfishness."

Indians, too, are Articulate

Joseph R. Garry, President of the National Congress of American Indians, sent a notice (dated Feb. 9, 1954) to all tribes, calling an "Emergency Conference of American Indians on Legislation." Mr. Garry sketches the purpose of the conference, and urges every tribe to send delegates, whether members of NCAI or not. He concludes his letter:

> Most of the pending legislation, if passed, would quickly result in the end of our last holdings on this continent and destroy our dignity and distinction as the first inhabitants of this rich land. The supreme test for our strength and our will to survive, as Indians, is now before us. In this emergency we must stand united as one Indian Nation with courage to defend the hopes and ideals common to all of us. In standing together to oppose injurious legislation and to support and develop constructive programs instead, we shall not only conserve Indian values but serve the best interests of the United States as a nation by protecting its national honor.

Indians Proud of Race

The Indian is intensely race-conscious in a dignified way. He knows much of courage, endurance, integrity—and sees that few lighter-colored Americans share these virtues. Yet he is prepared to serve wholeheartedly in a worthy cause, as in the fighting of forest fires.

The United States Forest Service has learned that when Indians are organized in their own units, under their own leaders, and using their own techniques, they are exceptionally effective aids in fire suppression. A passage in a column by Lee Priestley (in the Williston, N.D., *Herald* of Feb. 13) sets off Mr. Collier's plea for justice:

> The cry of "Apaches!" used to mean disaster, but today it brings hope for areas threatened by dangerous forest fires. A band of fire-fighting experts has been recruited from the descendants of the once dreaded chieftains Cochise, Naiche, Victorio and Geronimo by the United States Forest Service. . . . "The Indians are coming!" now means help when fire threatens the forests that are among our greatest national resources.

The Shadow of Censorship

A few writers, at least, are daily calling attention to the fact that "the shadow of censorship" is dimming the light of free inquiry. Thus E. Claypool in the Los Angeles *Daily News* (Jan. 6):

> We have warned before and we repeat our warning today that censorship of both the printed word and the movies is on its way in America and it will take some doing to stop it.
>
> During two world wars the government took the position that the publishers and editors of America's newspapers were decent citizens and patriotic and intelligent enough to know what should be printed and what shouldn't be. They worked very well at it and the exceptions were small and trivial. Movie producers believe they can do the same, especially as to morals.
>
> Nevertheless, Alabama, starting Jan. 1, put into effect a law that says no textbooks will be used in public schools until the authors have filed an affidavit about their past. They seem to do it on the assumption that any person who would write, edit or publish a subversive textbook wouldn't lie about his beliefs.
>
> In Arkansas a survey of secondary school and college textbooks in sociology is under way in a search for subversive ideas. Who decides what is subversive and what are their qualifications?
>
> In Texas there was a hot debate in the State Board of Education recently over inclusion of the United Nations declaration of Human Rights in history textbooks. The board finally voted to include it. Eugene R. Smith of El Paso, who opposed inclusion, said it ran contrary to Texas thinking.

Drops that Make the Ocean

Such incidents represent a cross-section of what is occurring throughout the country. Book-burnings, firing and intimidation of teachers, the steam-roller methods of many School Boards, all attest to the fact that a perennial foe—fearful intolerance—has rapidly gained a great deal of power.

Stuart Chase, writing in the *Progressive* for February, suggests that much of the popular fear and ignorance comes through the practice of "headline reading." Headlines are slanted to make quick, deep impressions. "By the time the headlines are through," says Mr. Chase, "the editorial writers haven't got a chance." Now, when the "psychic capacities" continually threaten to "outrun the manasic"—it is certainly highly important for each person to exercise his power of impartial judgment.

Fear Is Silencing Our Stage

Since motion pictures are also apparently falling under the shadow of censorship, further comments in the *Daily News* (Jan. 6) are pertinent. Mr. Roy Ringer, writing on "Our Silent Stage," says:

> Perhaps the most disturbing failure of the American theater today is its reluctance to deal with social themes. Our playwrights rarely identify themselves with conflict or concern themselves with the human realities of our time.
>
> We have had, instead, a sterile theatrical literature that whisks its audience away from reality and toward pure escapism. Our stage accepts, for the most part, only one responsibility—that of "entertaining."
>
> This is a far cry from the role theater should play in our lives. The stage, historically, has been a social force—a rostrum from which playwrights spoke out against injustice and ignorance and in support of new causes and ancient liberties.
>
> Ibsen was a leader in the struggle for woman's emancipation, and other playwrights of vision and courage have traditionally bound themselves to social progress.

Potential Instrument of Education

The stage, on Mr. Ringer's view, if it is to perform any significant role in the lives of the people, must be an instrument for education or, as he puts it, "it must take part in the life and struggle outside its door and indicate for its audience, as it has in the past, new and broader lifeways. A theater that has nothing to say will soon find that it has no one to say it to, and we are rapidly coming to that." However, according to Maxwell Anderson in one of his remarkable *Off Broadway* essays, the theater is a true phoenix, always ready for vital rebirth. Anderson argues that the public will always finally support meaningful art—art that tells something of the story of the soul.

Thus it becomes clear why the works of dramatists, such as Shakespeare, remain alive and vigorous. They "have something to say" about moments of decision, both psychological and social. If drama no longer is to play a vital role in focussing moral and social issues, it is an empty gesture—not worthy of being classed as a true "art."

Censorship, as the foregoing articles indicate, often protects people's foibles and sustains their complacency—in short, supports the status quo. Thoughtful criticism, on the other hand, attacks mere conformity, stimulates individual thinking, and attempts a genuine evaluation of

basic societal trends. "How do you get a country to want to raise the level of mass culture?", is one of the questions Robert M. Hutchins considers in *The Conflict in Education* (Harper, 1953):

> This depends on criticism, criticism by individuals, minorities, and centers of independent thought. This is the reason for academic freedom and freedom of speech generally. The best definition of a university that I have been able to think of is that it is a center of independent thought. . . . Unless criticism of the culture is permitted, the culture cannot be changed; certainly the schools will not be permitted to change it.
>
> How do you get a country to permit criticism? This can only be done if the country recognizes that an uncriticized culture cannot long endure. The hope of the West is that the church and the university are still free. I must add that there is no hope in the university unless it takes seriously its mission as a center of independent thought. . . .
>
> Indoctrination and propaganda have no place in it. The private opinions of teachers are not to be pumped or pounded into young people any more than the majority opinion is. But in my observation, there is not much danger to our youth from the improprieties of their instructors or the radical views that they may entertain. A far greater danger is that the majority will exert pressure on the educational system for indoctrination in and compulsory adoption of the majority opinion. The rule of the majority without free discussion and criticism is tyranny.

Positive Values Essential

Mr. Hutchins considers that education for adjustment, for meeting immediate needs or for social reform, is not enough. This sort of education defeats itself at the source; it trains only an economic man, a tool of society. Mr. Hutchins believes strongly that:

> Every man has a function as a man. The function of a citizen or a subject may vary from society to society, . . . but the function of a man as man is the same in every age and in every society, since it results from his nature as a man. The aim of an educational system is the same in every age and in every society where such a system can exist: it is to improve man as man.
>
> The prime object of education is to know what is good for man. It is to know the goods in their order. There is a hierarchy of values. The task of education is to help us understand it, establish it, and live by it. To destroy the Western tradition of independent thought it is not necessary to burn the books. All we have to do is to leave them unread for a couple of generations.

TOWARD FREE THOUGHT

All cultures pin their hopes on the younger generation, either to maintain the status quo or to improve it. But if improvement is the objective, says Mr. Hutchins—

> The problem is to retain the values of the age of discovery, to regain those of the age of debate, and to put an end to the age of the digest. And the problem is to do this through the university as a whole.
>
> Such an institution would be composed of men who were prepared to conduct a continuous Socratic dialogue on the basic issues of human life. They would be specialists, but they would have passed beyond specialism. They would bring their specialized training and points of view to bear upon the common task of clarification and understanding. . . . They would establish a genuine communion of minds.

ANOTHER UNIVERSITY ESSAYS THIS ROLE

The February issue of THEOSOPHY called attention to the identification-criticism classes which were inaugurated last September at Brown University in an attempt to raise the level of critical, liberal thought among undergraduates. Yale University seems to be going a step farther. According to an editorial in the *Saturday Review* (March 20), "Yale University has recently announced a program to spur 'a powerful revival of the liberal arts' in American high schools through enhancement of the university's training program for teachers:"

> This is good news for those who believe that in the present-day world of convulsive political events and consequent uncertainties men and women stand more than ever in need of those internal resources which alone can buttress their personal lives against the pressure and menace of public issues. They stand in need of those very things the liberal arts bestow: beauty and elevation of thought, and the understanding that comes from knowledge of the past as well as the present.
>
> [Broad educational influences] are undoubtedly building a public literate to an extent that it never was before, but it is one whose literacy is as yet only skin deep, for it lacks the evocative power of knowledge, that immense enrichment of enjoyment and usefulness which comes from the connotative value of facts and example.

Thus, what H. P. Blavatsky saw and clearly stated in 1889 is now recognized and repeated by many: "We should aim at creating *free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects."